

Am



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/473,544	12/28/1999	VIJAY K. BHAGAVATH	1999-0515	1102

7590 03/26/2004

SAMUEL H DWORETSKY
AT&T CORP
PO BOX 4110
MIDDLETOWN, NJ 077484110

EXAMINER

JAIN, RAJ K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2664

3

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/473,544

Applicant(s)

BHAGAVATH ET AL.

Examiner

Raj Jain

Art Unit

2664

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nurenberg et al.

The applied reference has a common Assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C.

102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding claim 1 Nurenberg discloses method of providing summary information about recipients of multicast sessions (**see abstract and Fig 1**), comprising the steps of enhancing the operation of an edge device to count the number of recipient hosts of an IP multicast session (**see col 4 lines 10-17, 6 lines 15-40, the MUG (multicast-unicast gateway) transmits the messages which contain a “list” of multicast addresses which is equivalent to the “number” of recipient hosts receiving (such) messages**);

storing the count in a measurement device and supplementing the count with information supplied from a directory source (see **Fig 2, 204**, the sessions database stores the list of multicast sessions and any additional information is passed to the database via listener process 203, see also col 5 lines 1-15);

generating aggregate information about audience levels and demographics of recipient hosts of the multicast session (see **Col 1 lines 25-40**, multiple users within a multicast session are aggregated into “groups or group addresses” which forms the audience level for a given area or demographics); and

supplying the information to a supplier of the multicast session permitting an immediate evaluation and response (see **col 1 lines 52-67**, the MUS receives and makes appropriate session decisions for the requesting clients for each media type).

Regarding claim 2, Nurenberg discloses enhancing the operation of an edge device, which includes a step of counting streams traversing a MUG type edge device using a unicast link between the edge device and the recipient hosts (see **Fig 1, Unicast Routers 112, 113**, which provides a unicast link between the edge device and MUG).

Regarding claim 3, Nurenberg discloses, use of IP addressing of recipient hosts of the multicast session connected to the edge device (see **Fig 1, col 3 lines 27 – col 4 lines 17**).

Regarding claims 4, 8-10 Nurenberg discloses, reporting IGMP membership and leave group reports from a host recipient to an edge device (see **col 6 lines 27-40**).

Regarding claim 5, Nurenberg discloses aggregating information collected to insure privacy of individual host recipients (see **col 1 lines 25-50**).

Art Unit: 2664

Regarding claim 6, Nureberg discloses IGMP reporting and query (membership information) one of which may include billing (see col 6 lines 27-40).

Regarding claim 7 Nureberg discloses creating a directory-listing members of groups of multicast host recipients (see col 1 lines 52-65, col 5 line 12 - col 6 lines 60 and Figs 4a and 4b).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raj Jain whose telephone number is 703-305-5652. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on 703-305-4336. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

RJ
March 22, 2004



WELLINGTON CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600